

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants have carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the Application. The Applicants have amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the Application.

I. Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner has stated that the Claim 1 recitation of "said interpreter" has insufficient antecedent basis. In response, Claim 1 is amended to recite "said processing server" instead of "said interpreter." Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection to Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 16-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 16-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0014493 to Ford ('Ford'). In response to the Examiner's reliance on Ford, the Applicants submit herewith Affidavits under 37 C.F.R §1.131 of the inventors and Exhibits A-F. Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of an Invention Submission form and Exhibits B-F are copies of correspondence and other legal forms associated with the present Application.

The Affidavits and Exhibit A conclusively provide evidence that establishes that the present invention was conceived prior to the priority date of Ford (July 15, 2003). The Affidavits and Exhibits B-F demonstrate diligence from the conception of the invention to reduction to practice at the filing of the present Application. As a result, Ford is antedated by the present invention. Thus, Ford is not a proper prior art reference and does not anticipate Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 16-17 and 19. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection with respect to these claims.

III. Rejection of Claims 3- 5, 8, 10, 13-15, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0211856 to Zillacus ("Zillacus"). The Examiner has rejected Claims 4, 8, 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0211856 to Aarnio ("Aarnio"). The Examiner has rejected Claims 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford. The Examiner has rejected Claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0181200 to Iida ("Iida"). As discussed above, Ford is not a prior art reference. Accordingly the above cited combinations do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claims 3- 5, 8, 10, 13-15, 18 and 20. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 3- 5, 8, 10, 13-15, 18 and 20 and allow issuance thereof.


IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC


J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: October 19, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800